

ORIGINAL

OPEN MEETING



MEMORANDUM
RECEIVED

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

TO: THE COMMISSION

2007 SEP -5 P 4: 43

SEP 05 2007

FROM: Utilities Division

AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

DATE: September 5, 2007

DOCKETED BY	
-------------	--

RE: SOUTHWEST GAS CORPORATION – APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF ITS MULTI-FAMILY NEW CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (A DEMAND SIDE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM) (DOCKET NO. G-01551A-04-0876)

On June 26, 2006, Southwest Gas Corporation (“Southwest”) filed an application for approval of its Multi-Family New Construction (“Multi-Family”) program, as required by Decision No. 68487. Decision No. 68487 required that the Company file detailed descriptions of its DSM programs within 120 days of the Commission’s February 23, 2006 Order approving rate changes effective March 1, 2006.

The proposed program would be newly-implemented and would provide incentives to builders of multi-family apartments to follow ENERGY STAR® guidelines. The Multi-Family New Construction (“Multi-Family”) program is one of seven demand-side management (“DSM”) programs included in Southwest’s 2006 Arizona Demand Side Management Program Plan.

Program Description

The program is designed to raise energy efficiency standards for the construction of apartment buildings and to improve awareness of high efficiency measures among apartment builders and renters. Financial incentives are proposed for the following energy-efficiency measures: sealed ductwork, programmable thermostats, compact fluorescent lights and high-efficiency water heaters. These above incentives would be paid to builders of apartment complexes in the Phoenix and Tucson areas.

Staff is recommending against approval of this program because it would require gas utility customers to fund a DSM program offering only electric savings, and because it would result in a large net increase in natural gas usage. There are, in addition, fuel switching issues with respect to using DSM dollars to install natural gas measures in a market usually dominated by electric use.

Delivery, Marketing and Communication

The target market of this program would be multi-family apartment builders in the greater Phoenix and Tucson areas. The target market includes builders in these areas who serve

THE COMMISSION

September 5, 2007

Page 2

seniors and low-income customers. Marketing and communication would be carried out through:

- one-on-one contacts between builders and Southwest staff members, particularly Southwest's Service Planning Department;
- a brochure and banners promoting the program;
- advertisements in the *Arizona Republic* and *Apartment.com*;
- Southwest website information and through a toll-free Energy Services Department hotline (for both consumers and builders);
- Southwest's work with the Arizona Department of Commerce Energy Office, to promote the program with Low-Income Housing Tax Credit program participants.

The program would also attempt to create awareness among renters of the benefits of more energy-efficient apartments; this awareness would be promoted through leasing agents, who would receive education under the program, and who would provide renters with a flyer concerning the program.

Incentives

There are two incentive levels available under the program. One level reflects incentives available to the 10 percent of the Arizona apartment market usually equipped with natural gas¹ while the other level of incentives is for the 90 percent of the Arizona apartment market that would usually feature all-electric units. The two levels of incentives reflect the differing costs of including gas water heaters.

10% Multi-Family Market (with natural gas)

Measure	Incentives
Duct sealing	\$150
Programmable Thermostats	\$20
Gas Water Heater	\$43
CFL(minimum x 2)	\$15
Total	\$228

¹ Generally, only apartments in luxury projects are equipped with natural gas, in addition to electricity.

90% Multi-Family Market (usually all-electric)

Measure	Incentives
Duct sealing	\$150
Programmable Thermostats	\$20
Gas Water Heater	\$398
CFL(minimum x 2)	\$15
Total	\$583

Testing and Verification

As part of the implementation process, outside contractors would be hired to verify and test the duct sealing done by participating builders. The outside contractors would also verify the installation of other DSM measures under the auspices of the Multi-Family program.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Southwest proposes to track and measure the program in the following ways: (i) number of program participants, (ii) number of units constructed, (iii) measures installed, (iv) number and results of ducts tests, (v) rebates processed, (vi) energy savings in therms and kWh, (vii) number of communication activities; (viii) website hits; and (ix) consumer and builder inquiries. Southwest may hire an outside contractor to carry out the measurement and evaluation portion of the program.

Southwest indicates that it might also conduct a follow-up survey. (A survey is listed in the proposed budget.) Participants would be asked to evaluate the program and marketing, while non-participating builders would be surveyed to determine their reasons for opting out of the program.

Program Budget

The estimated total budget for the proposed Multi-Family program is \$1.2 million dollars, allocated as shown below. \$1.2 million represents approximately 27 percent of the total Southwest DSM budget of \$4,385,000. Incentives make up 91.25 percent of the budget, while marketing costs run from 4.7 percent to 4.8 percent and outside contractors (for implementation) would total 3.75 percent. Measurement/Evaluation and Administrative costs under the proposed Multi-Family program would be minimal:

Program Year	2007	2008	2009
Implementation			
Outside contractors	\$45,000	\$45,000	\$45,000
Marketing/Communication			
Newspapers, magazines, Banners and brochures	\$56,000	\$57,500	\$57,500
Incentives			

Incentive amounts	\$1,095,000	\$1,095,000	\$1,095,000
Measurement and Evaluation			
Outside contractors	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500
Survey	\$500	\$500	\$500
Administrative Costs			
Office supplies	\$1,000	\$500	\$500
Travel expenses	\$1,000		
TOTAL	\$1,200,000	\$1,200,000	\$1,200,000

Staff recommends that no portion of the Southwest Gas DSM budget be allocated to the proposed Multi-Family project.

Cost-Benefit Analysis

Cost-Effectiveness Ratio

Southwest estimated a cost-effectiveness ratio of 2.17 for its proposed Multi-Family program. Staff modified Southwest's cost-effectiveness to remain consistent with other DSM programs, and to reflect removal of programmable thermostats as a measure.² In addition, because data was provided on a separate basis for the two incentive levels available under this program, Staff has calculated two cost-effectiveness ratios. For the 10 percent of apartments that would normally be equipped with gas, Staff calculates a cost-effectiveness ratio of 2.34, while for the 90 percent of apartments that would usually be all-electric, Staff estimates a cost-effectiveness ratio of 0.42.³ With 90 percent of potential DSM projects well below the level required for cost-effectiveness, the program as a whole can not be considered cost-effective.

Environmental Benefits

Staff has modified Southwest's estimated emissions savings to exclude the savings projected for programmable thermostats. It is Staff's understanding that the increased therm usage resulting from this program was not taken into account by Southwest in calculating the environmental savings. An estimation that included the increased therm usage under this program would have the effect of offsetting the benefits set forth below, although the net benefits would still occur.

² Multiple studies have indicated that residential programmable thermostats do not yet result in energy savings, and the Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") is in the process of removing the Energy Star designation from this measure.

³ Program with a cost-effectiveness ratio below 1.0 are considered not cost-effective.

THE COMMISSION

September 5, 2007

Page 5

Annual Savings	CO ₂	NO _x	SO _x	H ₂ O
2007	5,615,194	1,054	26	1,426,761
2008	5,615,194	1,054	26	1,426,761
2009	5,615,194	1,054	26	1,426,761
Lifetime Savings	274,700,721	51,525	1,288	69,798,548

Staff Analysis

Although apartment amenities, like pools or barbeques, are usually gas-powered, approximately 90 percent of the individual apartment units in Arizona are all-electric. As a result, most of the energy savings available at apartment complexes are also electric. While several measures in the Multi-Family program proposed by Southwest would provide electric savings, none would provide gas savings. In fact, as stated below, net natural gas usage would increase by millions of therms as a consequence of this gas DSM program. Southwest Gas ratepayers, including senior and low-income customers, should not be asked to fund a DSM program that provides no direct savings to gas utility customers. Staff recommends that this program not be approved by the Commission.

Another issue with respect to the Multi-Family program relates to fuel switching. In Appendix D to its program description, Southwest estimated kWh savings of 334,839,966, while estimating *increased* gas usage at 3,859,200 therms. Staff's understanding is that, under this program, Southwest would provide incentives to participating builders to install gas piping⁴ and gas water heaters to apartments that would normally have been all-electric. The effect of this program would be to subsidize Southwest's ability to compete in a market normally dominated by electric utilities.

Staff shares Southwest's concern about finding ways to benefit low-income customers. As stated earlier, Southwest has proposed a \$1.2 million budget for the Multi-Family program. Staff recommends that Southwest explore the feasibility of shifting this funding to the existing Low-Income Energy Conservation ("LIEC") program. The LIEC program is cost-effective, provides natural gas savings and lowers energy costs for Southwest's low-income customers. Staff recommends that Southwest file a report no later than 60 days from the date of this decision regarding the feasibility of reallocating the proposed Multi-Family program funding to the LIEC program, including with the report a plan for how the funding is to be reallocated. Should Southwest determine that reallocating the funding to the LIEC program would not be feasible, Southwest must provide a plan for allocating the Multi-Family funding to an alternative Southwest DSM program or programs.


⁴ The cost of installing piping to apartment building that would normally be all-electric is included as part of the incremental cost of the gas water heater measure.

Reporting Requirements

Staff has recommended that the Multi-Family program not be approved and, for this reason, has not made recommendations regarding the type of program information that should be included in Southwest's semi-annual DSM reports.

Summary of Staff Recommendations

- Staff has recommended that no portion of the Southwest Gas DSM budget be allocated to the proposed Multi-Family program.
- Staff recommends that the Multi-Family program not be approved.
- Staff recommends that Southwest explore the feasibility of shifting the funding proposed for the Multi-Family program to the existing Low-Income Energy Conservation ("LIEC") program.
- Staff recommends that Southwest file a report no later than 60 days from the date of this decision regarding the feasibility of reallocating the proposed Multi-Family program funding to the LIEC program, including with the report a plan for how the funding is to be reallocated. Should Southwest determine that reallocating the funding to the LIEC program would not be feasible, Southwest must provide a plan for allocating the Multi-Family funding to an alternative Southwest DSM program or programs.

for 
Ernest G. Johnson
Director
Utilities Division

EGJ:JMK:lhv\JMA

ORIGINATOR: Julie McNeely-Kirwan

1 **BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION**

2 MIKE GLEASON
3 Chairman
4 WILLIAM A. MUNDELL
5 Commissioner
6 JEFF HATCH-MILLER
7 Commissioner
8 KRISTIN K. MAYES
9 Commissioner
10 GARY PIERCE
11 Commissioner

12 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION
13 OF SOUTHWEST GAS CORPORATION –
14 FILING FOR APPROVAL OF ITS MULTI-
15 FAMILY NEW CONSTRUCTION
16 PROGRAM
17 _____

DOCKET NO. G-01551A-04-0876
DECISION NO. _____
ORDER

18 Open Meeting
19 September 18 and 19, 2007
20 Phoenix, Arizona

21 BY THE COMMISSION:

22 FINDINGS OF FACT

23 1. Southwest Gas Corporation (“Southwest”) is engaged in providing natural gas
24 within portions of Arizona, pursuant to authority granted by the Arizona Corporation Commission.

25 2. On June 26, 2006, Southwest Gas Corporation (“Southwest”) filed an application
26 for approval of its Multi-Family New Construction (“Multi-Family”) program, as required by
27 Decision No. 68487. Decision No. 68487 required that the Company file detailed descriptions of
28 its DSM programs within 120 days of the Commission’s February 23, 2006 Order approving rate
29 changes effective March 1, 2006.

30 3. The proposed program would be newly-implemented and would provide incentives
31 to builders of multi-family apartments to follow ENERGY STAR® guidelines. The Multi-Family
32 New Construction (“Multi-Family”) program is one of seven demand-side management (“DSM”)
33 programs included in Southwest’s 2006 Arizona Demand Side Management Program Plan.

34 ...

35 ...

1 4. Program Description

2 The program is designed to raise energy efficiency standards for the construction of
3 apartment buildings and to improve awareness of high efficiency measures among apartment
4 builders and renters. Financial incentives are proposed for the following energy-efficiency
5 measures: sealed ductwork, programmable thermostats, compact fluorescent lights and high-
6 efficiency water heaters. These above incentives would be paid to builders of apartment
7 complexes in the Phoenix and Tucson areas.

8 5. Staff has recommended against approval of this program because it would require
9 gas utility customers to fund a DSM program offering only electric savings, and because it would
10 result in a large net increase in natural gas usage. There are, in addition, fuel switching issues with
11 respect to using DSM dollars to install natural gas measures in a market usually dominated by
12 electric use.

13 6. Delivery, Marketing and Communication

14 The target market of this program would be multi-family apartment builders in the
15 greater Phoenix and Tucson areas. The target market includes builders in these areas who serve
16 seniors and low-income customers. Marketing and communication would be carried out through:

- 17 • one-on-one contacts between builders and Southwest staff members, particularly
18 Southwest's Service Planning Department;
- 19 • a brochure and banners promoting the program;
- 20 • advertisements in the Arizona Republic and Apartment.com;
- 21 • Southwest website information and through a toll-free Energy Services Department
22 hotline (for both consumers and builders);
- 23 • Southwest's work with the Arizona Department of Commerce Energy Office, to
24 promote the program with Low-Income Housing Tax Credit program participants.

25 7. The program would also attempt to create awareness among renters of the benefits
26 of more energy-efficient apartments; this awareness would be promoted through leasing agents,
27 who would receive education under the program, and who would provide renters with a flyer
28 concerning the program.

8. Incentives

There are two incentive levels available under the program. One level reflects incentives available to the 10 percent of the Arizona apartment market usually equipped with natural gas¹ while the other level of incentives is for the 90 percent of the Arizona apartment market that would usually feature all-electric units. The two levels of incentives reflect the differing costs of including gas water heaters.

10% Multi-Family Market (with natural gas)

Measure	Incentives
Duct sealing	\$150
Programmable Thermostats	\$20
Gas Water Heater	\$43
CFL(minimum x 2)	\$15
Total	\$228

90% Multi-Family Market (usually all-electric)

Measure	Incentives
Duct sealing	\$150
Programmable Thermostats	\$20
Gas Water Heater	\$398
CFL(minimum x 2)	\$15
Total	\$583

9. Testing and Verification

As part of the implementation process, outside contractors would be hired to verify and test the duct sealing done by participating builders. The outside contractors would also verify the installation of other DSM measures under the auspices of the Multi-Family program.

10. Monitoring and Evaluation

Southwest proposes to track and measure the program in the following ways: (i) number of program participants, (ii) number of units constructed, (iii) measures installed, (iv) number and results of ducts tests, (v) rebates processed, (vi) energy savings in therms and kWh, (vii) number of communication activities; (viii) website hits; and (ix) consumer and builder

¹ Generally, only apartments in luxury projects are equipped with natural gas, in addition to electricity.

1 inquiries. Southwest may hire an outside contractor to carry out the measurement and evaluation
2 portion of the program.

3 11. Southwest indicates that it might also conduct a follow-up survey. (A survey is
4 listed in the proposed budget.) Participants would be asked to evaluate the program and
5 marketing, while non-participating builders would be surveyed to determine their reasons for
6 opting out of the program.

7 12. Program Budget

8 The estimated total budget for the proposed Multi-Family program is \$1.2 million
9 dollars, allocated as shown below. \$1.2 million represents approximately 27 percent of the total
10 Southwest DSM budget of \$4,385,000. Incentives make up 91.25 percent of the budget, while
11 marketing costs run from 4.7 percent to 4.8 percent and outside contractors (for implementation)
12 would total 3.75 percent. Measurement/Evaluation and Administrative costs under the proposed
13 Multi-Family program would be minimal:

Program Year	2007	2008	2009
Implementation			
Outside contractors	\$45,000	\$45,000	\$45,000
Marketing/Communication			
Newspapers, magazines, Banners and brochures	\$56,000	\$57,500	\$57,500
Incentives			
Incentive amounts	\$1,095,000	\$1,095,000	\$1,095,000
Measurement and Evaluation			
Outside contractors	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500
Survey	\$500	\$500	\$500
Administrative Costs			
Office supplies	\$1,000	\$500	\$500
Travel expenses	\$1,000		
TOTAL	\$1,200,000	\$1,200,000	\$1,200,000

21
22 13. Staff has recommended that no portion of the Southwest Gas DSM budget be
23 allocated to the proposed Multi-Family project.

24 14. Cost-Benefit Analysis

25 *Cost-Effectiveness Ratio*

26 Southwest estimated a cost-effectiveness ratio of 2.17 for its proposed Multi-Family
27 program. Staff modified Southwest's cost-effectiveness to remain consistent with other DSM
28 ...

1 programs, and to reflect removal of programmable thermostats as a measure.² In addition, because
2 data was provided on a separate basis for the two incentive levels available under this program,
3 Staff has calculated two cost-effectiveness ratios. For the 10 percent of apartments that would
4 normally be equipped with gas, Staff calculates a cost-effectiveness ratio of 2.34, while for the 90
5 percent of apartments that would usually be all-electric, Staff estimates a cost-effectiveness ratio of
6 0.42.³ With 90 percent of potential DSM projects well below the level required for cost-
7 effectiveness, the program as a whole can not be considered cost-effective.

8 15. Environmental Benefits

9 Staff has modified Southwest's estimated emissions savings to exclude the savings
10 projected for programmable thermostats. It is Staff's understanding that the increased therm usage
11 resulting from this program was not taken into account by Southwest in calculating the
12 environmental savings. An estimation that included the increased therm usage under this program
13 would have the effect of offsetting the benefits set forth below, although the net benefits would
14 still occur.

Annual Savings	CO2	NOx	SOx	H2O
2007	5,615,194	1,054	26	1,426,761
2008	5,615,194	1,054	26	1,426,761
2009	5,615,194	1,054	26	1,426,761
Lifetime Savings	274,700,721	51,525	1,288	69,798,548

19 16. Staff Analysis

20 Although apartment amenities, like pools or barbeques, are usually gas-powered,
21 approximately 90 percent of the individual apartment units in Arizona are all-electric. As a result,
22 most of the energy savings available at apartment complexes are also electric. While several
23 measures in the Multi-Family program proposed by Southwest would provide electric savings,
24 none would provide gas savings. In fact, as stated below, net natural gas usage would increase by
25 millions of therms as a consequence of this gas DSM program. Southwest Gas ratepayers,
26

27 ² Multiple studies have indicated that residential programmable thermostats do not yet result in energy savings, and the
28 Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") is in the process of removing the Energy Star designation from this
measure.

³ Program with a cost-effectiveness ratio below 1.0 are considered not cost-effective.

1 including senior and low-income customers, should not be asked to fund a DSM program that
2 provides no direct savings to gas utility customers. Staff has recommended that this program not
3 be approved by the Commission.

4 17. Another issue with respect to the Multi-Family program relates to fuel switching.
5 In Appendix D to its program description, Southwest estimated kWh savings of 334,839,966,
6 while estimating increased gas usage at 3,859,200 therms. Staff's understanding is that, under this
7 program, Southwest would provide incentives to participating builders to install gas piping⁴ and
8 gas water heaters to apartments that would normally have been all-electric. The effect of this
9 program would be to subsidize Southwest's ability to compete in a market normally dominated by
10 electric utilities.

11 18. Staff shares Southwest's concern about finding ways to benefit low-income
12 customers. As stated earlier, Southwest has proposed a \$1.2 million budget for the Multi-Family
13 program. Staff has recommended that Southwest explore the feasibility of shifting this funding to
14 the existing Low-Income Energy Conservation ("LIEC") program. The LIEC program is cost-
15 effective, provides natural gas savings and lowers energy costs for Southwest's low-income
16 customers. Staff has recommended that Southwest file a report no later than 60 days from the date
17 of this decision regarding the feasibility of reallocating the proposed Multi-Family program
18 funding to the LIEC program, including with the report a plan for how the funding is to be
19 reallocated. Should Southwest determine that reallocating the funding to the LIEC program would
20 not be feasible, Southwest must provide a plan for allocating the Multi-Family funding to an
21 alternative Southwest DSM program or programs.

22 19. Reporting Requirements

23 Staff has recommended that the Multi-Family program not be approved and, for this
24 reason, has not made recommendations regarding the type of program information that should be
25 included in Southwest's semi-annual DSM reports.

26 ...

27 _____
28 ⁴ The cost of installing piping to apartment building that would normally be all-electric is included as part of the incremental cost of the gas water heater measure.

1 20. Summary of Staff Recommendations

2 Staff has recommended that no portion of the Southwest Gas DSM budget be
3 allocated to the proposed Multi-Family project.

4 Staff has recommended that the Multi-Family program not be approved.

5 Staff has recommended that Southwest explore the feasibility of shifting the
6 funding proposed for the Multi-Family program to the existing Low-Income Energy Conservation
7 ("LIEC") program.

8 Staff has recommended that Southwest file a report no later than 60 days from the
9 date of this decision regarding the feasibility of reallocating the proposed Multi-Family program
10 funding to the LIEC program, including with the report a plan for how the funding is to be
11 reallocated. Should Southwest determine that reallocating the funding to the LIEC program would
12 not be feasible, Southwest must provide a plan for allocating the Multi-Family funding to an
13 alternative Southwest DSM program or programs.

14 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

15 1. Southwest is an Arizona public service corporation within the meaning of Article
16 XV, Section 2, of the Arizona Constitution.

17 2. The Commission has jurisdiction over Southwest and over the subject matter of the
18 application.

19 3. The Commission, having reviewed the application and Staff's Memorandum dated
20 September 5, 2007, concludes that it is not in the public interest to approve the Multi-Family New
21 Construction program.

22 ORDER

23 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Multi-Family New Construction program not be
24 and hereby is not approved.

25 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that no portion of the Southwest Gas DSM budget be
26 allocated to the proposed Multi-Family project.

27 ...

28 ...

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Southwest explore the feasibility of shifting the funding
2 proposed for the Multi-Family program to the existing Low-Income Energy Conservation
3 ("LIEC") program.

4 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Southwest docket no later than 60 days from the date of
5 this decision, as a compliance item in this matter, a report regarding the feasibility of reallocating
6 the proposed Multi-Family program funding to the LIEC program, including with the report a plan
7 for how the funding is to be reallocated. Should Southwest determine that reallocating the funding
8 to the LIEC program would not be feasible, Southwest must provide a plan for allocating the
9 Multi-Family funding to an alternative Southwest DSM program or programs.

10 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Decision shall become effective immediately.

11 **BY THE ORDER OF THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION**

12
13 _____
CHAIRMAN

COMMISSIONER

14
15
16 COMMISSIONER

COMMISSIONER

COMMISSIONER

17 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I DEAN S. MILLER, Interim
18 Executive Director of the Arizona Corporation Commission,
19 have hereunto, set my hand and caused the official seal of
20 this Commission to be affixed at the Capitol, in the City of
Phoenix, this _____ day of _____, 2007.

21
22 _____
DEAN S. MILLER

23 Interim Executive Director

24
25 DISSENT: _____

26
27 DISSENT: _____

28 EGJ:JMK:lhv\JMA

Decision No. _____

1 SERVICE LIST FOR: Southwest Gas Corporation
2 DOCKET NO. G-01551A-04-0876

3 Ms. Debra S. Jacobsen
4 Director, Government & State
5 Regulatory Affairs
6 Southwest Gas Corporation
7 5241 Spring Mountain Road
8 Las Vegas, NV 89150-0002

9 Mr. Ernest G. Johnson
10 Director, Utilities Division
11 Arizona Corporation Commission
12 1200 West Washington
13 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

14 Mr. Christopher C. Kempley
15 Chief Counsel
16 Arizona Corporation Commission
17 1200 West Washington
18 Phoenix, Arizona 85007
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28